



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/662,811 | 09/16/2003 | Hendrik Gerlach | 1454.1501 | 1111 |
| 21171 | 7590 | 06/02/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP | | | CHAI, LONGBIT | |
| SUITE 700 | | | | |
| 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | 2131 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/02/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory

1. As per each of independent claims, Applicant asserts Ott does not teach (a) “an external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on the outside of the appliance” (remarks; Page 8 / 3rd Para) and (b) in Ott, the security server is not a client computer, i.e. an appliance (Remarks: Page 8 Last Para). Examiner respectfully disagrees because (1) Ott teaches, in one of its embodiments, the network security system can display the current network status in virtually real-time to an operator of the system (Ott: Para [0043]) (2) Applicant’s argument has no merit since the alleged limitation “a client computer” has not been recited into the claim (i.e. using “appliance” instead). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
2. Furthermore, Applicant asserts “Ott does not teach “an internal display to display the current security status of the appliance within an inside of the appliance, because there is no internal event data log in Ott” (Remarks: Page 10 / 3rd Para). Examiner respectfully disagrees because (1) recording of events related to various process within the computer network including logs (Ott: Page 4 / Para [0026] / the 2nd-last TABLE entry “Events”) (2) Examiner notes the event log must thus be captured, stored and identified as an event log inside the security server where the security status identified as an internal event log of a server is qualified as an internal display of the server – This is also consistent with the specification of the instant application specification that states “the

internal display" may be a simple mechanism such as the setting of a flag (SPEC: Para [0024] last two sentences).